(b) whether it is also a fact that lot of funds were either diverted or unspent under the SGSY in several States;

(c) if so, which were the State where the rules were flouted in implementing the scheme; and

(d) the action proposed to be taken against the erring States?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT (SHRI U. V KRISHNAM RAJU): (a) As per C & AG Report No. 3 of 2003, under SGSY, three member teams consisting of Block Development Officer or his representative, a Banker and Pradhan of the Panchayat were not constituted in the States and UTs of Andhra Pradesh, Himachal Pradesh, Jammu& Kashmir, Karnataka and Dadra & Nagar Haveli.

(b) and (c) Some instances of diversion/misutilisation of SGSY funds amounting to Rs. 58.39 crore in the States and UTs of Andhra Pradesh, Arunachal Pradesh, Assam, Bihar, Chattisgarh, Dadra & Nagar Haveii, Daman & Diu Goa; Gujarat, Jammu & Kashmir, Karnataka, Madhya Pradesh, Maharashtra, Manipur. Mizoram, Orissa, Pondicherry, Tamil Nadu and West Bengal have been reported during the period of 1999—2002 in the Report No. 3 of 2003 of Comptroller & Auditor General. Observations of C & AG have been sent to the State Governments and UTs for sending the Action Taken Reports.

(d) In order to monitor the programme closely, various Committees from Central Level down to the Block Level have been constituted. These meet at regular intervals and give directions to the implementors of the programme to follow the guidelines. These Committees include representatives of Bankers, Rural Development Officials, Non Government Organizations, line Departments etc. In addition to this, the Ministry through Monthly Progress Report (MPR), furnished by the DRDAs, monitors the physical and financial progress under the programme. Performance of the Scheme is also monitored by way of visits by the Senior Officers of the Ministry to the States/UTs under the Area Officer Scheme.

Poor coverage of SGSY

915. SHRI C. RAMACHANDRAIAH : Will the Minister of RURAL DEVELOPMENT be pleased to state :

(a) whether it is a fact that only 4.59 per cent of the total BPL families were covered during 1999—2002 under Swarnjayanti Gram Swarozgar Yojana (SGSY) and as a result of this the target of covering of at least 30 per cent of the BPL families under the scheme in five years also appears unrealizable;

(b) if so, the reasons for the poor coverage of the scheme between 1999-2002;

(c) the state which were lagging in the implementation of the Scheme;

(d) whether it is also a fact that the funding pettern of the SGSY i.e. in the ratio 75:25 by the Centre and the State, was not stricitly followed and there was a significant shortfall in the release of matching funds in several States;

(e) whether there were large scale diversions, misutilisation and parking of funds curtailing the actual funding for the programme in several States; and

(f) if so, the details thereof?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT (SHRI U. V. KRISHNAM RAJU): (a) and (b) Coverage of Below Poverty Line families during initial years of implementation of Swarnjayanti Gram Swarozgar Yojana (SGSY) was slow and it was expected as it is a process oriented scheme and has adopted a new concept of group approach. In the guidelines of SGSY it was mentioned that the effort should be to see that broadly 30% of the rural poor in the block are covered during the next five years. However this was subject to availability of funds. Subsequently this provision has been deleted during the course of amendments to the guidelines of the SGSY because the availability of funds has not been comparable and also because the target oriented approach has been given up so as to have qualitative improvement in the implementation of the programme. The reasons for low coverage during initial years was due to the fact that during the first and second year of implementation of the scheme much of the time was utilized for training and sensitization of development functionaries and banks officials, constitution of committees at various levels, identification of key activities, preparation of project reports, social mobilization for formation of Self Help Groups and training of SHGs etc.

(c) There Was significant shortfall in term of expenditure in relation to the funds available in the States of Bihar, Jharkhand, Uttar Pradesh and West Bengal.

(d) The State Governments should release their contribution within one month of date of sanction of central releases. During the course of the performance review meeting it was noticed that a few states were not releasing their contribution in time. On ascertaining the reasons from the State Governments, it was observed that significant delay was due of budgetary constraint. Some North Eastern States like Assam and Manipur could not release their matching share. The reasons for short release to State share is due to enhancement of allocation by the Government of India so as to provide 10% of total resources for the North Eastern States. As a result, the State Matching Share has increased, which North Eastern States are unable to provide due to their weak financial position.

(e) and (f) Some instances of diversion/misutilisation/parking of SGSY funds amounting to Rs.58.39 crore in the State of Andhra Pradesh, Arunachal Pradesh, Assam, Bihar, Chattisgarh, Dadra & Nagar Haveli, Daman & Diu, Goa, Gujarat, Jammu & Kashmir, Karnataka, Madhya Pradesh, Maharashtra, Manipur Mizoram, Orissa, Pondicherry, Tamil Nadu and West Bengal have been reported during the period of 1999—2002 in the Report No.3 of 2003 of Comptroller & Auditor General. Observations of C&AG have been sent to the State Governments for sending their Action Taken Reports.

Sanitation coverage in India

916. SHRI EKANATH K. THAKUR : Will the Minister of RURAL DEVELOPMENT be pleased to state :

(a) whether it is a fact that the total sanitation coverage in India by 2003 only stands at 42 per cent, while rural coverage is about 28 percent; and

(b) if so, whether it is a fact that the Ministry has resolved to sanction the Total Sanitation Campaign (TSC) projects to all districts in the country by the end of 2006 and the projects would be completed by the 2010 deadline?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT (SHRI ANNASAHEB M. K. PATlL): (a) Yes, Sir.